

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants herein respond to the Examiner's Office Action as follows:

The above amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to the application and support for the amendments to claims can be found in the specification. The amendments do not include any new subject matter and are made as a matter of form not substance.

It is believed that all matters raised in paragraphs 1-3 and 5-7 2 have been addressed. With regard to the objection in paragraph 4, Applicant has checked each of its submissions and does not find the typographical error suggested by the Examiner. However, if the submitted documents demonstrate otherwise, Applicant agrees that Claim 7 should read "wet-in-wet" and not "w t-in-wet".

As amended, it is believed that all issues raised by the Examiner with regard to the alleged indefiniteness in the claims have been addressed.

In paragraphs 8 and 9, the Examiner has also rejected claims 9,2,3,10 as allegedly anticipated by Larson, et al (US 5,260,101) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). The Applicants respectfully traverse this objection. It is evident from the claims as amended, the mixing ratios of the components are changed for each application to among other reasons, adjust the reactivity of the like components such that coating compositions with various properties as suitable for the different substrates to be sprayed are created from the same fixed components. Coating composition must have different properties to effectuate a proper repair depending on the needs of the substrate to be sprayed and the present invention allows for these ever changing needs without the need to change the fixed components.

For a rejection to be sustained under §102(b) each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed in the cited prior art reference. It is respectfully submitted that Larson fails to disclose ability to spray different coating compositions on a variety of substrates having various requirements using the same fixed components and doing so by simply changing the mixing ratios of the fixed components.

Moreover nothing in Larson even suggests the idea that its components would remain fixed where the needs of the substrate would be different.


Finally, in paragraphs 10 and 11, claims 3 - 8 are rejected as allegedly obvious under Larson et al (U.S. 5,260,101) in view of Vu (U.S. 4,710,560). Applicants respectfully traverse this objection for at least the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants request that the above amendments be entered. In view of the amendments and remarks herein and the papers submitted previously, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the subject rejections. The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Early consideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Applicant's attorney thanks the Examiner for speaking with her on June 22, 2004, and suggesting a follow up call in early July.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Joan M. McGillyuddy  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 35,608

Akzo Nobel Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
7 Livingstone Avenue  
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408  
Tel No.: (914) 674-5463